

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.N.KRISHNAN

MONDAY, THE 30TH JULY 2007 / 8TH SRAVANA 1929

Tr.P(C).No. 238 of 2006

O.P.780/2005 OF FAMILY COURT,THRISSUR.

PETITIONER/RESPONDENT IN O.P. 780/05:

VALSALA, AGED 29 YEARS,
D/O.SEDHUMADHAVA PANICKER,
UMMANAZHI KALARICKAL, PULAPPATTA VIA.,
UMMANAZHI P.O., UMMANAZHI AMSOM DESOM,
PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.V.BOSE,
SRI.VINOD MADHAVAN,
SMT.NISHA BOSE.

RESPONDENT/PETITIONER IN O.P. 780/05:

SUDHEER, AGED 35 YEARS,
S/O.SREEDHARA PANICKER @ SREEDHARA KURUP,
SUDHINA KALARIKKAL VEEDU, PULLOOT DESOM,
PULLOOT VILLAGE, P.O.PULLOOT NORTH,
KODUNGALLUR TALUK, THRISSUR DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.T.M.CHANDRAN,
SRI.V.A.SASIDHARAN.

THIS TRANSFER PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 30/07/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

M.N.KRISHNAN, J

=====

Tr.P.(C)No.238 OF 2006

=====

Dated this the 30th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

The petitioner is the respondent in O.P.No.780 of 2005 on the file of the Family Court, Thrissur. She wants the case to be transferred to Palakkad to be tried along with M.C.No.53 of 2007 pending before that court. The grounds urged for transfer are: The petitioner is jobless and she is living at the mercy of her family members. She needs the assistance of somebody to accompany her to Thrissur, which is not possible at every time to attend the court. I am not satisfied with the 2nd ground urged by the petitioner in this petition. But it is only an apprehension or apprehension sake.

The Family Court at Thrissur is 100 kms. away from the residence of the petitioner whereas the Family Court at Palakkad is hardly 25 kms. from her house. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, O.P.No.780 of 2005 pending before the Family Court, Thrissur is transferred to the Family Court, Palakkad for trial and disposal. I make it clear that the case has to be tried by the Family Court at the Headquarters at Palakkad as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within six months from today. If there are sufficient reasons to dispense with the presence of the husband on some

Tr.P(C)238/2006

-:2:-

of the posting dates, the court shall not insist for his presence if the reason alleged is true.

Tr.P.(C) is disposed of as above.

M.N.KRISHNAN, JUDGE

Cdp/-